

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1, 5-7, 10, 11, 15-17, 20, 33, 35, 37, and 38 are pending, with Claims 1, 10, 11, 20, 33, and 35 being independent.

Claims 1, 11, 33, and 35 have been amended. Applicants submit that support for these amendments can be found in the original disclosure at least, for example, at page 11, line 20 through page 12, line 6 of the specification. Therefore, Applicants submit that no new matter has been added.

Initially, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider his position regarding the corrected 1449 form submitted on October 18, 2004. The Office Action characterizes that form as both “redundant and unnecessary.” Applicants respectfully submit that it is neither. As explained in detail in the October 18, 2004 transmittal letter, the corrected form contains corrected bibliographic information for the two cited documents. Thus, the 1449 form is not redundant because it contains corrected information as compared to the originally-submitted form. Further, the corrected 1449 is necessary so that the record accurately identifies the references that the Examiner has considered. The list of “References Cited” on an issued patent is generated from the information on 1449 and 892 forms in the file. Thus, the corrected 1449 form is necessary because otherwise a patent issued on this application will inaccurately identify the bibliographic information for the references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner initial the corrected 1449 form and return a copy to Applicants.

Claims 1, 11, 33, and 35 are objected to under 37 CFR § 1.75(d)(1) because the phrase “inputting a user’s designation regarding a position and direction of a viewpoint” is allegedly not disclosed in the specification. Claims 1, 11, 33, and 35 are also objected to under 37 CFR § 1.75(a) because the meaning of the phrase “user designation” is allegedly unclear and not defined in the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that claim language is not required to have *in haec verba* support in the specification, i.e., the exact terms used in the claims do not have to appear in the specification if one skilled in the art would understand what is being claimed. Nevertheless, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 11, 33, and 35 so that the claim language more closely tracks the language of the specification. Applicants submit that the amended language is clear and clearly supported by the specification. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections are requested.

Claims 1, 11, 33, and 35 are rejected under 35.U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,337,882 (Boyer, et al). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

As recited in independent Claim 1, the present invention relates to an image reproduction apparatus for performing walk-through in a virtual space. In such an apparatus, it is necessary for an image to be displayed quickly in response to a user’s operation. As recited in independent Claim 1 the present invention includes, *inter alia*, the features that each of a plurality of partial images shares an overlapping portion with adjacent partial images, that an angular field of view of a partial image doubles the angular field of the display, and that the whole of a partial image is overlapped by adjacent partial images. Due to these features, an image corresponding to a direction of a user’s viewpoint can always be generated from a single

partial image. Therefore, it is not necessary to combine partial images to generate an image, and an image can be generated and displayed quickly. Further, the degradation of image quality caused by combining images is also avoided.

Applicants submit that the cited art does not disclose or suggest the above-mentioned features, and therefore does not provide the advantages of the invention recited in Claim 1 wherein an image can be quickly generated from a single partial image. Boyer, et al. discloses using an inflated image (see col. 6, lines 22-30) but fails to disclose or suggest even determining angular field of a partial image based on an angular field of the display. Therefore, that patent cannot disclose or suggest at least the feature of storing a plurality of partial images obtained by dividing a panoramic image by a predetermined angular field of view, wherein the angular field of view of the partial images doubles the angular field of the display, each of the partial images shares an overlapping portion with adjacent partial images, and the whole of a partial image is overlapped by adjacent partial images.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present invention recited in independent Claim 1 is patentable over the cited art. Independent Claims 11, 33, and 35 recite similar features and are believed patentable for similar reasons.

Claims 5, 10, 15, 20, 37, and 38 are rejected under 35.U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,337,882 (Boyer, et al) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,661,455 (Toyofuku et al.). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

As recited in independent Claim 10, the present invention includes, among others, the feature wherein a storage unit stores each partial image as a 90° rotated image. Due to this feature, as discussed with respect to Fig. 18B, for example, complexity in controlling a memory

address when cutting out and combining partial images is eliminated. Applicants submit that the cited art, considered alone or combination, does not disclose or suggest at least this feature.

The Examiner asserts that Toyofuku, et al. discloses this feature at col. 10, lines 46-57 (with respect to Fig. 6). However, the cited portion of the document merely discloses a header portion of image data that indicates a rotation direction. This merely indicates how an image is rotated, but there is no disclosure or suggestion of storing partial images as a 90° rotated image.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the present invention recited in independent Claim 10 is patentable over the cited art. Independent Claim 20 recites similar features and is believed patentable for similar reasons.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, and a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "B. L. Klock", is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicants

Brian L. Klock

Registration No. 36,570

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
BLK/lmj

DC_MAIN 200746v1